

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10, 22-31, 43, 44 and 53-58 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 22, 25, 43, 54 and 57-58 are amended, and claims 10, 31 and 53 are canceled herein. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 22-30, 43, 44 and 54-58 are currently pending. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

### *Examiner Interview Summary Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b)*

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephonic Examiner Interview on January 10, 2012. Applicant discussed the differences between the sector-level equipment deployment of Applicant's invention and the system-level service deployment of Adduci. Applicant further discussed the "investment return per sector" claim limitations not being found in Adduci. Lastly, Applicant and Examiner discussed incorporating limitations similar to those of claim 10 into independent claim 1, and discussed these limitations with respect to the disclosure of Weller.

### *Claim Rejections*

The Office Action mailed on May 10, 2011 rejected claims 1, 4, 22, 25, 53, 54, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adduci et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,343,334 ("Adduci") in view of Cossins et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0083073 ("Cossins") and Elliot, U.S. Patent No. 7,158,790 ("Elliot"). The Office Action rejected claims 2, 3, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adduci in view of Cossins and Elliot, and further in view of AAPA. The Office Action rejected claims 5-10 and 26-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Adduci in view of Cossins and Elliot, and further in view of Weller et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,107,224 (“Weller”). The Office Action rejected claims 43, 44, 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adduci in view of Cossins and Elliot, and further in view of Scheinert, U.S. Patent No. 5,787,344 (“Scheinert”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “prioritizing, using the computer system, the sectors based upon the investment return per sector for each of the sectors, to determine a prioritized order of the sectors for capital investment; and selecting one of the wireless network sectors for equipment deployment based at least in part on a highest priority in the prioritized order of the sectors.”

Amended independent claim 22 recites “network use” and “computer program code for prioritizing the sectors based upon the investment return per sector for each of the sectors, to determine a prioritized order of the sectors for capital investment; and computer program code for identifying one of the wireless network sectors for equipment deployment based at least in part on a highest priority in the prioritized order of the sectors.” Also, a “number of minutes of use” has been changed to “network use” in both claims.

Basis for these amendments may be found, for example, in original claims 10, 21, 31 and 42, and in the specification on page 1, lines 15-24, page 2, lines 16-18, page 4, lines 8-10, page 4, lines 19-22, page 5, lines 1-11, page 5, lines 21-23, page 6, lines 11-15, and page 6, lines 24-28.

Adduci, Cossins and Elliot do not teach or suggest the above-recited limitations. Weller also does not teach or suggest these claim limitations. Weller states that “the build component 150: (1) reduces implementation time by providing packaged object-oriented analytical models; (2) improve decision accuracy by utilizing actual vs. inferred customer values and needs; and (4)

allows companies to prioritize investments to get the best possible corporate return.” Weller, col. 10, lines 1-7. Weller describes a value-driven, integrated build-to-buy decision analysis system and method, *see, e.g., id.* at col. 1, lines 1-3, and, in a particular embodiment, describes how a telecommunications customer can use the system to select a cellular phone service, such as analog or digital phone service. *See, e.g., id.* at col. 5, lines 48-60. As with Adduci, Weller provides an analysis at the service level, and does not teach or suggest how to prioritize individual wireless network sectors for capital investment, let alone selecting one of the sectors for equipment deployment based on a highest priority in the prioritized order of the sectors.

Therefore, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest these limitations of independent claims 1 and 22, and Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1 and 22 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 2-9, 43, 44 and 54 depend from claim 1, and claims 23-30 and 55-58 depend from claim 22, and add further limitations to their respective independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicant's Attorney, Brian A. Carlson, at 972-732-1001. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due in connection with this filing, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

January 23, 2012

Date

/Brian A. Carlson/

Brian A. Carlson

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 37,793

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218